



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REPORT ON QUESTIONNAIRE OF COMMITTEE ON TEACHING

F. STUART CHAPIN
Columbia University

To the Members of the Committee on Teaching, American Sociological Society:

GENTLEMEN: In accordance with Professor Jerome Dowd's request I herewith present to you this abstract and digest of the material returned in answer to the committee's questionnaire sent out during the investigation into the subject-matter of beginning courses at present given in colleges of the country under the title of Sociology.

The following questionnaire, at the approval of Professor Jerome Dowd, chairman of the committee, was sent out to some four hundred colleges, universities, theological schools, and state normal schools.

COMMITTEE ON TEACHING

AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY

PROFESSOR JEROME DOWD, *Chairman*

DEAR SIR: The American Sociological Society has appointed a committee of ten of its members to report to the next annual meeting:

First, a statement of the subject-matter of first courses at present given in colleges of the country under the title of Sociology.

Second, a suggested outline for a fundamental introductory course in Sociology.

Will you kindly assist in this work by filling out the accompanying questionnaire?

- A. Name of institution.
- B. Name and title of person filling out this blank.
- C. Please paste here a clipping from your catalogue giving the statement of your beginning course in Sociology.
- D. Give an outline of the subject-matter of that course and add the list of authors and their works assigned for students to read in connection with the course.

(*Subject-Matter*)(*Authors and References*)
- E. Suggest the subject-matter for a fundamental course to serve as a basis for advanced work if the beginning course you now give does not fully answer the purpose of a fundamental course.

The list of institutions to which the questionnaire was sent was made up as follows:

Mr. L. L. Bernard kindly let me have the questionnaire returned to him during the course of the investigation into "The Teaching of Sociology in the United States" conducted under the auspices of and published in the *American Journal of Sociology* in September, 1909. From this material a list was made of the names and addresses of professors and departmental heads who taught sociology. In this manner a list of 199 institutions was obtained which had answered Mr. Bernard favorably and which were therefore known to teach sociology. To this number were added the 167 institutions which Mr. Bernard gave in Table IV of his report. The names of these institutions were added because in going through their catalogues Mr. Bernard found that they gave courses in sociology although they had not answered the questionnaire. Finally, to the 366 institutions thus obtained were added some 30 institutions. A few of these had reported to Mr. Bernard's questionnaire as intending to give courses in sociology in the near future, but the majority of these were obtained from the list of colleges in the *World Almanac* for 1910. The final total was 396 institutions to which the above questionnaire was sent on October 15 of the present year.

From the four hundred odd institutions addressed by the questionnaire, some 145 answers were received. Of this number 128 reported as teaching sociology and 17 reported no course in sociology. Of the total answers, 126 were from colleges and universities, 5 were from theological schools, and 14 were from state normal schools. Fifteen colleges and universities offered no course in sociology and two state normal schools offered no course.

TABLE I

INSTITUTIONS ANSWERING THE QUESTIONNAIRE

NOTE.—Institutions marked * give no course in sociology; institutions marked † are interested in the report of the committee; institutions marked *† expect to start a course soon.

†Adelphi College	Brooklyn, N.Y.	Professor Annie M. Mac- Lean
Albany College	Albany, Ore.	Professor F. G. Franklin
Albion College	Albion, Mich.	Professor F. T. Carlton

TABLE I—*Continued*

Albright College	Myerstown, Pa.	Professor C. A. Bowman
*Amherst College	Amherst, Mass.	Professor J. W. Crook
Augustana College	Rock Island, Ill.	Professor E. F. Bartholomew
*Bates College	Lewiston, Me.	Professor D. W. Brandelle
Baker University	Baldwin, Kans.	Professor H. J. Hoover
Beloit College	Beloit, Wis.	Professor R. C. Chapin
Boston University	Boston, Mass.	Professor F. S. Baldwin
Bryn Mawr College	Bryn Mawr, Pa.	Dr. Marion Parris
Carleton College	Northfield, Minn.	Professor E. E. Robinson
Catholic University of America	Washington, D.C.	Professor W. J. Kerby
Carthage College	Carthage, Ill.	Professor S. N. Carpenter
†Central College	Pella, Ia.	Professor J. L. Beyl
Colgate University	Hamilton, N.Y.	Professor E. W. Goodhue
Cornell College	Mount Vernon, Ia.	Professor H. H. Freer
†Clafin University	Orangeburg, S.C.	Professor G. Evans
Clark College	Worcester, Mass.	Professor F. H. Hankins
Coe College	Cedar Rapids, Ia.	Professor C. T. Hickok
Colorado College	Colorado Springs, Colo.	Professor F. A. Bushee
Cumberland University	Lebanon, Tenn.	Professor W. P. Bone
Columbia University	New York City	Professor F. H. Giddings
Dartmouth College	Hanover, N.H.	Professor D. C. Wells
*†Davidson College	Davidson, N.C.	Professor J. M. McConnell
De Pauw University	Greencastle, Ind.	Professor C. C. North
Des Moines College	Des Moines, Ia.	Professor S. Z. Batten
Dickinson College	Carlisle, Pa.	Professor G. A. Crider
*Doane College	Crete, Neb.	Professor A. B. Fairchild
Earlham College	Richmond, Ind.	Professor H. Lindley
*Emory College	Oxford, Ga.	Professor E. H. Johnson
Eureka College	Eureka, Ill.	Professor A. C. Gray
*†Georgetown College	Georgetown, Ky.	Professor A. Yager
George Washington University	Washington, D.C.	Professor R. R. Kern
Goucher College	Baltimore, Md.	Professor T. P. Thomas
Guilford College	Guilford, N.C.	Professor D. D. Carroll
Grand Island College	Grand Island, Neb.	Professor E. H. Sutherland

TABLE I—*Continued*

Harvard University	Cambridge, Mass.	Professor T. N. Carver
Haverford College	Haverford, Pa.	Professor D. C. Barrett
Hendrix College	Conway, Ark.	President A. C. Millar
Hobart College	Geneva, N.Y.	Professor J. M. Williams
*Illinois College	Jacksonville, Ill.	President C. H. Rammelkamp
*Iowa State College	Ames, Ia.	Professor B. H. Hibbard
James Millikin University	Decatur, Ill.	Professor W. W. Smith
*†Jamestown College	Jamestown, N.D.	Professor F. B. Taylor
Juniata College	Pittsburgh, Pa.	Professor C. C. Johnson
*Johns Hopkins University	Baltimore, Md.	Professor J. M. Vincent
Keuka College	Keuka Park, N.Y.	Professor G. W. Eddy
†Knox College	Galesburg, Ill.	Professor J. H. Raymond
†Lake Erie College	Painesville, O.	Miss Florence Ball
Lawrence College	Appleton, Wis.	Professor C. J. Bushnell
*Leland Stanford Jr. University	Stanford University, Cal.	Professor I. B. Cross
Louisiana State University	Baton Rouge, La.	Professor W. O. Scroggs
McMinnville College	McMinnville, Ore.	Professor F. G. Boughton
Macalester College	St. Paul, Minn.	Professor G. W. Davis
Marietta College	Marietta, O.	Professor A. T. Perry
Marshall College	Huntington, W.Va.	Professor J. U. Fitzgerald
Morningside College	Sioux City, Ia.	Professor F. E. Haynes
Miami University	Oxford, O.	Professor S. E. W. Bedford
Millsaps College	Jackson, Miss.	Professor J. E. Walmsley
Mount Holyoke College	South Hadley, Mass.	Professor Amy Hewes
Nebraska Wesleyan University	University Place, Neb.	Professor E. H. Wells
Northwestern University	Evanston, Ill.	Professor F. S. Dribler
New York University	New York, N.Y.	Professor R. M. Bender
Oberlin College	Oberlin, O.	Professor A. B. Wolfe
Olivet College	Olivet, Mich.	Professor H. A. Miller
Ohio State University	Columbus, O.	Professor J. E. Hagerty
Oriental University	Washington, D.C.	President H. P. Holler
Pacific University	Forest Grove, Ore.	Professor L. B. Shippee
Park College	Parkville, Mo.	Professor T. M. Matthews
Parker College	Winnebago, Minn.	Professor M. Lewis

TABLE I—*Continued*

Parsons College	Fairfield, Ia.	Professor P. C. Hildreth
Pennsylvania College	Gettysburg, Pa.	Professor C. F. Sanders
*Princeton University	Princeton, N.J.	Professor H. J. Ford
Purdue University	La Fayette, Ind.	Professor T. F. Moran
Radcliffe College	Cambridge, Mass.	Professor T. N. Carver
Randolph-Macon Woman's College	College Park, Va.	Professor E. E. Ayers
St. Olaf College	Northfield, Minn.	Professor C. A. Mellby
*St. John's College	Fordham University, N.Y.	Professor T. J. Barrett
Simmons College	Boston, Mass.	President Henry Lefavour
Smith College	Northampton, Mass.	Professor Georgia Laura White
*†Stevens Institute of Technology	Hoboken, N.J.	President A. C. Humphreys
Talladega College	Talladega, Ala.	Professor D. B. Pratt
Taylor University	Upland, Ind.	Professor Newton Wray
*Trinity College	Durham, N.C.	Professor W. H. Glasson
Tri-State College	Angola, Ind.	Professor Lorin Stuckey
Tufts College	Tufts College, Mass.	Mr. L. M. Bristol
University of Colorado	Boulder, Colo.	Professor J. B. Phillips
†University of Florida	Gainesville, Fla.	Professor E. M. Banks
University of Indiana	Bloomington, Ind.	Professor V. G. Weatherby
University of Kentucky	Lexington, Ky.	Professor E. Tuthill
University of Pennsylvania	Philadelphia, Pa.	Professor J. P. Lichtenberger
University of Nebraska	Lincoln, Neb.	Professor Elliott Howard
University of Notre Dame	Notre Dame, Ind.	Professor M. J. Walst
University of Montana	Missoula, Mont.	Professor J. H. Underwood
University of Michigan	Ann Arbor, Mich.	Professor C. H. Cooley
University of Missouri	Columbia, Mo.	Professor C. A. Ellwood
University of North Dakota	Grand Forks, N.D.	Professor J. M. Gillette
University of Oklahoma	Norman, Okla.	Professor Jerome Dowd
University of Porto Rico	Porto Rico	Professor E. H. Casterlin
University of Puget Sound	Tacoma, Wash.	Professor J. C. Zeller
University of South Dakota	Vermillion, S.D.	Professor E. G. Nourse
†University of Minnesota	Minneapolis, Minn.	Professor S. N. Reep
†University of Southern California	Los Angeles, Cal.	Professor R. D. Hunt
University of Utah	Salt Lake City, Utah	Professor G. Coray

TABLE I—*Continued*

University of Wisconsin	Madison, Wis.	Professor E. A. Ross
*†University of Wyoming	Laramie, Wyo.	Professor J. D. LeCron
University of Vermont	Burlington, Vt.	Professor H. W. Lawrence
University of Virginia	Charlottesville, Va.	Professor W. H. Heck
University of Chicago	Chicago, Ill.	Professor W. I. Thomas
University of Illinois	Urbana, Ill.	Professor E. C. Hayes
University of California	Berkeley, Cal.	Professor Lucy C. Mount
Upper Iowa University	Fayette, Ia.	Professor J. W. Dickman
Wake Forest College	Wake Forest, N.C.	Professor E. W. Sikes
Washburn College	Topeka, Kan.	Professor D. M. Fisk
†Washington College	Chestertown, Md.	Professor J. W. Cain
Washington and Jefferson College	Washington, Pa.	Professor E. M. Weyer
†Washington and Lee University	Lexington, Va.	Professor S. D. Hancock
Wellesley College	Wellesley, Mass.	Professor Emily G. Balch
Wesleyan University	Middletown, Conn.	Professor W. C. Fisher
Western Reserve University	Cleveland, O.	Professor J. E. Cutler
Wheaton College	Wheaton, Ill.	Professor Elliot Whipple
Whitworth College	Tacoma, Wash.	Professor W. E. Roe
William Jewell College	Liberty, Mo.	Professor E. C. Griffith
*Williams College	Williamstown, Mass.	Professor G. Droppers
Yale College	New Haven, Conn.	Professor A. G. Keller

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES

Auburn Theological Seminary	Auburn, N.Y.	Professor A. S. Hoyt
Drew Theological Seminary	Madison, N.J.	Professor E. L. Earp
Hartford Theological Seminary	Hartford, Conn.	Professor A. R. Merriam
Meadville Theological School	Meadville, Pa.	Professor N. P. Gilman
Western Theological Seminary	Pittsburgh, Pa.	President J. A. Kelso

NORMAL SCHOOLS

*State Normal College	Troy, Ala.	Professor E. M. Shackelford
State Normal School	San José, Cal.	Professor Gertrude F. Rowell

TABLE I—*Continued*

(Course in social psychology based on Ross)

*California State Normal School	Chico, Cal.	Professor E. J. Miller
Western Illinois State Normal School	Macomb, Ill.	Professor Alfred Bayliss
Central Michigan Normal School	Mount Pleasant, Mich.	Professor C. S. Larzelere
State Normal School	Duluth, Minn.	Professor E. W. Bohannon
State Normal School	Springfield, Mo.	Professor B. M. Anderson
Westfield Normal School	Westfield, Mass.	Professor J. C. Hockenberry
State Normal School	Mayville, N.D.	Professor C. M. Correll
Northern Normal and Industrial School	Aberdeen, S.D.	Professor W. E. Johnson
State Normal School	Bellingham, Wash.	Professor James Bever
State Normal School	Milwaukee, Wis.	Professor W. H. Chewer
State Normal School	Oshkosh, Wis.	Professor F. R. Clow
Hampton Institute	Virginia	Professor T. J. Jones

Comparing these results with Mr. Bernard's, it is worthy of note that 95 of the institutions which answered the committee's questionnaire are found in Mr. Bernard's Tables I, II, and III, comprising institutions which answered him favorably. Some 27 of the answers to the committee's questionnaire were from institutions in Mr. Bernard's Table IV, comprising institutions which taught sociology but did not answer him. The remaining 23 answers of the 145 reporting to the committee's questionnaire are from institutions not contained in either of Mr. Bernard's tables but given in the *World Almanac* list of colleges for 1910. Of the 23 new institutions thus obtained 12 are at present teaching sociology.

The material sent in has been classified with the object in view of having such a classification as representative as possible of the general significance of the 150 odd answers. It has been the effort of the writer of this report to use an objective standard of classification obtained from the totality of the material itself. To this end the broadest possible divisions of the subject-matter were chosen and the various statements made upon the questionnaire

regarding the subject-matter of the courses were copied and marked one for each time they occurred. Thus Anthropology was definitely spoken of nearly 40 times; Poor Relief and Pauperism nearly 25 times; the Biological Method was emphasized 16 times, etc. In many instances, however, there was no such specific statement. In such cases the writer had to classify the subject-matter of the course as Historical, Psychological, Practical, etc., in accordance with the general characteristics of the textbook or reference book mentioned. This latter method was resorted to only when it was impossible to get specific statements of the subject-matter. This situation obtained in about 12 per cent of the cases.

It will be noticed that the mark for the general division is in most cases smaller than the sum of the marks of specified subject-matter. Thus the mark for Historical subject-matter is only 84, while the sum of 40, 37, 52, and 56, the specific marks, is considerably over 150. The reason for this is that very often where the Historical subject-matter was specified there were also carefully specified several definite fields such as Anthropology, Ethnology, and Social Institutions. This same correction is true of the other divisions.

In many cases all six general divisions were emphasized, as were also the specific subdivisions. Many cases combined the practical with the theoretical. In this manner also the subdivisions became large.

The writer of this report wishes to make it emphatic that the numerical marks should not be taken too literally. The effort has been to classify a mass of very heterogeneous material so as to show its most representative elements; the effort has not been to produce an exact and exhaustive analysis. This would be almost impossible considering the nature of many of the replies. In this respect the writer found it difficult to classify such a specified field as Sociological Theory, which obviously overlaps the Historical and Psychological fields. It therefore seemed best to place this specified field by itself. The same may be said of Social Pathology, which might mean Social Psychology or some practical study of Criminology. It has therefore been placed by itself also.

TABLE II

CLASSIFICATION OF SUBJECT-MATTER OF COURSES IN SOCIOLOGY GIVEN BY
THE INSTITUTIONS NAMED IN TABLE I

I. Emphasizing Historical subject-matter	84
Including such fields specified as:	
Anthropology	40
Ethnology	37
Social Institutions	52
Social Evolution	56
	185
II. Emphasizing Psychological subject-matter	80
Including such fields specified as:	
Social Psychology	56
Association	29
Imitation	31
	116
III. Emphasizing Biological subject-matter	16
Including such fields specified as:	
Eugenics	5
Population (statistically treated)	6
	11
IV. Emphasizing Descriptive and Analytic	21
Including such fields specified as:	
Study of a specific social group	9
Physical Factors	10
	19
V. Emphasizing Economic subject-matter	22
Including such fields specified as:	
Industrial Conditions	10
Labor Problem	14
Practical economic problems not definitely specified	8
Socialism	8
	40
VI. Emphasizing Practical subject-matter	56
Including such fields specified as:	
Population problems of congestion and housing	23
American social problems	19
Social problems (not specified)	15
Visits to institutions	9
Poor Relief and Pauperism	25
Charity	23
Philanthropy	14
Crime and Criminology	20
Education	11
	159
VII. Subject-matter overlapping some of the above six divisions and therefore classified by itself.	
Specified as:	
Sociological Theory	40
Social Pathology	13

Divisions III and IV are also subject to the same criticism.

Some eighty institutions used a textbook as the basis of the work in their beginning course. The textbooks of the following authors were in use:

TABLE III

AUTHORS WHOSE TEXTBOOKS ARE USED IN BEGINNING COURSE IN SOCIOLOGY BY INSTITUTIONS NAMED IN TABLE I

Not specified.....	8	Henderson.....	1
Blackmar.....	8	Ross.....	8
Cooley.....	5	Small and Vincent.....	6
Carver.....	1	Sumner.....	2
Dealey.....	10	Thomas.....	1
Dealey and Ward.....	4	Ward.....	1
Devine.....	1	Wright.....	8
Ellwood.....	2	—	—
Fairbanks.....	1		86
Giddings.....	18		

Only a few of those reporting answered part E of the questionnaire, asking for suggestions regarding the subject-matter for a fundamental course to serve as a basis for advanced work. Those who did answer part E of the questionnaire were classified in accordance with the above method as they suggested Historical, Psychological, Practical, etc., subject-matter for the fundamental course, the emphasis on each being laid in the following manner:

TABLE IV

SUGGESTED SUBJECT-MATTER TO FORM A FUNDAMENTAL BEGINNING COURSE

Historical.....	28	Descriptive and Analytic..	7
Psychological.....	25	Economic.....	3
Biological.....	7	Practical.....	16

Among those who suggested subject-matter for a fundamental course in sociology the comments of the following are particularly pertinent:

1. Professor G. E. Howard, University of Nebraska, believes that a differentiation of the subject-matter of sociology into three main divisions would facilitate team work. The divisions are: I. Pure or General Sociology; II. Practical Sociology; III. Social Anthropology.

He says: "The work of our Associate Professor of Practical Sociology is intended to lay a scientific basis for social service. The beginning courses in Practical Sociology and Social Anthropology are mainly concerned with the concrete; while theory is more accented in Pure Sociology, first taken up by third-year students."

2. Professor W. I. Thomas, The University of Chicago, says, in speaking

of his introductory course in social origins devoted to anthropology and ethnology: "I regard my course as a good type of introduction for graduate work. A course in Social Science, bearing on the problems and relations of all the Social Sciences, with a statement of this general content and bearing, would, I think, be suitable as an introductory course for Sophomores."

3. Professor E. A. Ross, University of Wisconsin, says: "I can't say I believe much in a beginner's course. I would prefer to have my courses taken in this order: Sophomore year, Fall, Elementary Sociology; Spring, Charities and Corrections; Junior year, Fall, Social Psychology; Spring, General Sociology; Senior year, seminars such as Cities, The Family, Psychology of the American People."

4. Professor R. D. Hunt, University of Southern California, says: "A foundation course should combine as much as possible of the *generally accepted* 'principles' of Sociology with less of the controverted matter and a frank recognition of the *practical* aims of the subject in its entirety."

5. Professor C. H. Cooley, University of Michigan, says: "In my opinion the central problem of sociology is that of the interactions between personality (the individual, the socius, or whatever you may call it) and the social structures and processes. I would devote a beginning course to a very full and concrete exposition of what is most fundamental in this relation."

6. Professor C. A. Ellwood, University of Missouri, says: "If I were to give a beginning course in sociology *regardless of training for citizenship*, and could have mature students who I knew were specializing in the Social Sciences, I would begin the course with a study of the biological factors in association—Nutrition, Reproduction, Multiplication, Conflict, Selection, Heredity, etc., and continue it by a study of the psychological factors—Instinct, Feeling, Intellect, Imitation, Sympathy, Social Control, etc., and would end it with outlining a theory of Social Order and a theory of Social Progress."

7. Professor B. M. Anderson, State Normal School, Springfield, Mo., says: "I think a fundamental course should include a substantial amount of sociological theory, with enough historical and descriptive material to illustrate the theory. But the theory should be the thing stressed—I do not favor making too much concession to the pedagogical mania for 'concreteness.'"

In conclusion, it may be said that assuming the 145 answers as fairly representative of the institutions teaching sociology in the United States, the classification of these replies shows a majority laying emphasis upon theoretical subject-matter including the historical and psychological, as opposed to the practical subject-matter specified by Charity, Poor Relief, Philanthropy, etc. This same general conclusion may be drawn from Table IV representing the suggestions for a fundamental introductory course.

Finally, in the belief that one further source of material contained in the questionnaire might be of interest to the committee, the writer has added Table V.

TABLE V
TEXTS AND AUTHORITIES CITED BY AT LEAST FIVE INSTITUTIONS NAMED IN
TABLE I

<i>American Journal of Sociology</i>	7
Bagehot, <i>Physics and Politics</i>	5
Baldwin (not specified).....	7
Blackmar, <i>Elements of Sociology</i>	11
Bryce, <i>American Commonwealth</i>	6
Carver, <i>Sociology and Social Progress</i>	18
Comte (not specified).....	8
Cooley, <i>Social Organization</i>	19
U.S. Census.....	5
Dealey, <i>Sociology</i>	27
Ely, <i>Evolution of Industrial Society</i>	7
Fairbanks, <i>Introduction to Sociology</i>	14
Giddings, <i>Principles of Sociology</i>	29
“ <i>Elements of Sociology</i>	16
“ <i>Inductive Sociology</i>	7
“ <i>Descriptive and Historical Sociology</i>	16
“ Not specified.....	15
Henderson, <i>Social Element</i>	14
Kidd, <i>Social Evolution</i>	5
Le Bon, <i>The Crowd</i>	6
Plato, <i>The Republic</i>	5
Ross, <i>Social Psychology</i>	19
“ <i>Social Control</i>	7
“ <i>Foundations of Sociology</i>	7
“ Not specified.....	10
Small, <i>General Sociology</i>	16
Small and Vincent, <i>Introduction to Sociology</i>	19
Spencer, <i>Principles of Sociology</i>	22
“ <i>Study of Sociology</i>	6
“ Not specified.....	6
Thomas, <i>Source Book</i>	14
Tylor, <i>Anthropology</i>	6
Tarde, <i>Laws of Imitation</i>	10
Ward, <i>Pure Sociology</i>	12
“ <i>Applied Sociology</i>	11
“ <i>Dynamic Sociology</i>	37
Wright, <i>Practical Sociology</i>	21

Respectfully submitted,

F. STUART CHAPIN

DISCUSSION

FRANK D. WATSON, UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

The nature of the course in Freshman economics at the University of Pennsylvania is such that it might well be discussed in connection with such a conference as the present, as no hard-and-fast line is drawn in this course between the fields of sociology and economics. Many of the problems which are discussed in this introductory course are of a distinctly sociological nature, such as the problems of immigration, congestion, the school system, child labor, and women in industry. Of course, in handling all of these problems, their bearing on economics is indicated, the thought constantly emphasized being that they directly affect the efficiency of that important factor in production, labor. The handling of these problems is concrete and much of the subject-matter is of a descriptive nature.

One might say that the chief aim of the course is to interest the student in the social and economic life about him. Accordingly, problems of the above nature are put in the foreground, and theory is introduced merely as an aid in digesting and classifying the material given. We desire primarily in the first year that the men should connect the everyday facts about them, which they have probably not stopped to analyze, with their work in college. Pure theory is largely ignored until in the Sophomore year.

To carry out the general purpose of the course, the men are given in addition to their textbook work a list of books to read on which they write reviews or criticisms of several hundred words' length at the rate of one a month. These books are of such popular nature as Steiner's *On the Trail of the Immigrant*, *The Long Day*, by Dorothy Richardson, *The Making of an American*, by Jacob Riis, *The Spirit of Youth and the City Streets*, by Jane Addams, and *The Bitter Cry of the Children*, by John Spargo. An additional feature of the course is a list of outside magazine readings which are given to the men monthly and on which they are quizzed. These readings are on current economic discussions in such magazines as the *Independent*, the *World's Work*, the *Outlook*, etc. Our experience has been that this method not only attracts the interest of the student, but many times causes him to do additional reading independent of that which is required. For example, it has been my personal experience to have students bring to me magazine or newspaper clippings saying that they felt sure that I would be interested in them as they were just along the lines of the subjects that we had been discussing in class. As the year goes on, this practice seems to increase, showing what seems to be the fact, that many men in reading the newspapers and magazines are now attracted to subjects which formerly they passed over, for the simple reason that the subject-matter has been dignified by previous classroom presentation or discussion. Subsequently they seem to take somewhat of a professional attitude in their general reading on these subjects. As a result, many men accumulate a considerable amount

of economic material during their Freshman year. An attempt is made to digest and classify this material in classroom as far as time permits, although, as can readily be seen, an exhaustive study of no one of the problems can be attempted.

CHARLES A. ELLWOOD, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

At the University of Missouri we believe in a general elementary course in sociology which shall be prerequisite to the taking of any other course in the department. Professor Dowd did not include the University of Missouri a few minutes ago in the list of institutions giving a fundamental course. I beg leave to correct him. The elementary course in sociology at the University of Missouri is both fundamental and practical. It aims to present not only the fundamental facts of the social life but to present them in such a way that the simpler fundamental principles of sociology shall be evident. We believe in starting with facts rather than with theory, but in presenting the facts in such a way that theory or interpretation issues from them. The course aims to be inductive, and starts therefore with the concrete and biological rather than with abstract and psychological. After certain preliminary definitions, I have found it advisable, however, to point out first of all to the student the biological facts and principles which the sociologist must take account of, even in the simplest sociological interpretations, and which are therefore as much data for sociology as the facts of the social life itself.

The guiding thought of the elementary work in sociology at the University of Missouri, however, is the belief that sociology can be learned from the study of any concrete form of association or social group whatsoever; that just as the botanist can learn botany from the study of one or two typical plant types so the sociologist can find in any concrete form of association whatsoever most of the factors which are at work in the social life and can make this group reveal many of the essential problems of sociology. This method has the advantage of concreteness and at the same time of studying the social life in the little rather than in the mass. The student sees more plainly the actual forces at work molding and shaping human association, and if he is kept aware that he is simply studying an illustration, he has no difficulty in reasoning from the smaller and more concrete group to society in the mass.

For many years I have found the family group, as in many ways the most typical of all the forms of human association, to be the most convenient for introducing the student concretely to the science of sociology. The family group has the advantage that it is intimately known by every student. On account of the complexity of relationships involved in it the study of its origin, development, structure, and function serves to illustrate the origin, development, structure, and function of social forms generally. Of

course, there is danger that the student will mistake the illustration for social life as a whole, but this can easily be guarded against. About one-third of the course is taken up with the study of the family in its various aspects, after which various related concrete social problems, such as population, immigration, the negro problem, the city problem, and the like, are studied in order to illustrate further the working of biological and psychological factors in the social life. The whole plan of the course is very clearly set forth in my text on *Sociology and Modern Social Problems* which, however, omits many things such as discussions of scientific method, additional statistics, and the like, which are included in the course. The course also has at its end a number of lectures summarizing the results of the concrete inductive study with reference to the whole social life and briefly outlining a general view of social institutions, social organization, and social evolution. This I did not include in my published text, because I believe that it can best be done by every teacher for himself.

Judged by the standard of interest, this elementary course has been a success. For a number of years over one hundred students have been regularly enrolled in it. Now it is repeated each semester (coming five hours a week) and in each semester there are about one hundred students enrolled, or two hundred through the year. Judged also by the experience of my students in later life, the course has been found very helpful, especially by those who go into the law, the ministry, journalism, or teaching, to say nothing of those who enter practical social work.

I should add that at the University of Missouri students must have had a general course in history and a biological science before taking elementary sociology, and they are advised and expected to precede or follow it with an elementary course in economics or in political science or both. Branching from this fundamental elementary course in sociology at the University of Missouri are both theoretical and practical courses. The practical courses take up the subjects of philanthropy, social betterment, criminology, and penology, the social conditions of rural and urban communities, and the like. We also have strong courses in theoretical sociology, but these are open only to Seniors and graduates. They include a general course in sociological theory, a course in psychological sociology, a course in biological sociology, and a course in the history of sociology. The plan which we have been following has seemingly thus far worked well. There has been close co-ordination between practical and theoretical work, because both branch from the fundamental elementary course. While the practical work is mainly given to one man, and the theoretical work is mainly taken by another, yet this is not exclusively so, for we believe that practical study of social conditions and movements needs all the light which theoretical sociology can give it, and that, on the other hand, theoretical sociology needs the help which comes from vital contact with living facts and movements. While our plan has

worked well thus far, we are looking for ways and methods of improving it and should be glad for any suggestions which anyone who is teaching sociology can make from his experience.

ALBION W. SMALL

It has been a question in my mind for a long time whether it would not be possible to do a better thing for undergraduates in the social sciences by breaking away entirely from departmental programs, and by adopting an introductory course which would be a proper foundation for all advanced work in social science.

Of course Sophomores have a certain smattering of information which would have to be classified under each of the social sciences. Although their acquisitions are usually not abundant enough so to preoccupy the ground that further knowledge in either of these territories would be superfluous, yet the situation is not precisely as though we were dealing with utterly blank minds. Conceding, therefore, that all Sophomores have picked up a certain quantity of scrap information about social facts, our problem is to find out the best way of putting them on the track of precise and scientific study.

Without arriving at an agreement, or without even settling on a precise proposition, a number of the men in the social science departments at the University of Chicago have lately been wrestling with this question. There is certainly in the air a suspicion that we are defeating our own purposes by taking our academic departmental divisions too seriously. Are there not certain things which every Sophomore should know if he is to get the most out of Junior or Senior or graduate work in either of the social sciences? May there not be a body of material and an outlook which every Sophomore might acquire which would serve him better than any strictly departmental work in the Sophomore year?

Instead of making a theoretical argument on this question I submit a concrete proposal. I suggest that the social science departments in all our fully equipped institutions agree to offer a course running through the Sophomore year to be known as Social Science I, to be prerequisite for more advanced work in each department, and to be based on Schmoller's *Grundriss der allgemeinen Volkswirtschaftslehre*. The work might fairly be described as an outline of the evolution of human institutions. While it is intended as an introduction to economic theory, no one who is chiefly interested in other phases of society need fear that Schmoller's emphasis upon economic interests would give a Sophomore an essentially incorrect notion of the relative importance of the different divisions of human activity.

Here then is a conspectus representing the outlook of a man who is by common consent in the front rank of the economists of the world. Whatever

be our special academic interests, we can hardly differ on the proposition that a Sophomore who had taken this survey would have an enormous advantage over one who had not, in pursuing further study in the social sciences. It seems hardly open to question that our work in the different social sciences might be made much more effective if we could presuppose such a common background in the minds of our students. Without much abstract discussion of methodology Schmoller brings into view all the social factors, in their historical and in their contemporary aspects, which we have to distribute among social science departments for division of labor. There is not enough departmental sectarianism in the two volumes to make any of us sensitive. One of the European economists who ranks with Schmoller, but is not of his school, remarked to me a few years ago apropos of the *Grundriss*, "Yes it contains a little of everything except economics." It was the sneer of a rival, but it was not meant very seriously. It meant that this particular man would have introduced into the outline a much larger proportion of the psychology of the economic process. For the purpose which I now have in mind the change which the criticism called for would certainly not be an improvement.

Not speaking for the subject of sociology alone, but with the best judgment I am capable of with reference to the whole scope of the social sciences, I am convinced that we could not at present devise a measure which would do more to promote academic social science in general than the adoption of this suggestion.

JOHN LEWIS GILLIN, UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

This discussion has been a most interesting one to me. There is no doubt in my mind that equally important, perhaps, with the necessity of arriving at some conclusion as to what sociology is and what it is not, is the question of how it shall best be presented to college classes. It has come into our college curricula to stay. An increasing number of students demand that they know something about this new subject. It is important, therefore, that the best methods of teaching it should be known by all of us who have this important task to perform. To the younger men among us this is especially important, and it is to be hoped that future programs of this society will give a not unimportant place to the question as to how best to present the subject of sociology to students.

S. N. REEP

Professor Cutler has given us some very valuable suggestions regarding the organization of a department of sociology in an urban university; they are valuable because of the attempt to make the work fundamental and because it has gained the interest of the university community. There is one

point to which I wish to call attention which is not a criticism of Professor Cutler's paper. It is the distinction between the theoretical and practical which are often used interchangeably with abstract and concrete. In the minds of most students, and others also, theory may be good mental discipline but that which is really worth while is the practical. They do not distinguish social description, social interpretation, and social technology. All are dealing with social facts. The first describes them; the second finds their meaning; and the third studies the way by which new social facts may be evolved out of existing ones.

Now it seems to me that a fundamental course must be more than description and must precede technology. Mere description is not science and interpretation of social facts is necessary before there is a reason for any change.

I conclude therefore that a fundamental course in sociology is social theory or the interpretation of the meaning of social facts; and that the danger in outlining a fundamental course is not too much use of description but a weakness in interpretation due to too much consideration of "problems" which center the attention on technology.

J. E. CUTLER

A number of questions have been raised which it seems to me are worthy of further discussion. As we have already exceeded the time allotted to this session, however, I shall confine myself to two or three points and make my remarks brief.

The points made by Professor Kelsey are well taken. I am in hearty agreement with him. Those are points which we intend to bear in mind at Western Reserve.¹

The plan proposed by Professor Small is one that was put into operation in an experimental way at Yale University some seven years ago. I was interested in it from the beginning and for a time I had a part in it. Its development has been of special interest to me. In many ways it has been successful. The subject-matter of the course has been shown to be of value; the course has been popular among the students. In some other respects, however, the plan can scarcely be said to have been successful. Still I had a predilection for this kind of an introductory course when I went to Western Reserve University to establish the Department of Sociology. After giving the matter serious consideration, however, I did not dare to organize such a course and follow this plan.

As a matter of fact, I was in the position which many of you have also occupied, I am sure, where it was expected that you would arrange for college students some work that was specifically and definitely sociology—not history, or economics, or philosophy, or psychology, or anything else

¹The report of Professor Kelsey's remarks was not sent to the *Journal*.

than sociology. In this situation you are surrounded by fairly definite limitations. You must find for yourself and on your own responsibility some direct and effective way of introducing your students to the subject of sociology. The plan that I finally adopted is the one that I have described. I was of course aware that it was a plan somewhat different from that followed anywhere else; otherwise I should certainly not have made it the subject of a paper for this meeting.

Other considerations also may enter into this question of a proper introductory method. At Western Reserve University it was decided that the work in sociology should begin with the Junior year. A large percentage of our seniors are to be found in one or another of the professional schools—law, medicine, or engineering. These students who are pursuing a combination course with a professional school are entitled to consideration. They want to get some knowledge of sociology but they do not feel that they can give time to this subject unless it is clear that the knowledge that will be gained is of real value to them in connection with their professional work. It is necessary, therefore, that the courses in sociology be made definite, concrete and to the point; everything that is in any respect non-essential for this purpose must be excluded.

The courses in practical sociology have been organized to meet this situation. Students may begin the study of sociology by electing these courses. If at any time the results appear to be unsatisfactory, the whole plan is of course subject to change without notice. Thus far the results have been satisfactory. But this plan has the merit of proceeding from the known, that which is near at hand and is a part of actual experience, to that which is more remote from ordinary experience, the more general, the more abstract. It therefore rests upon what is surely a sound principle. All students who propose to specialize in sociology, however, are required to elect both the theoretical and the practical courses. Social evolution and the general principles of sociology are to be studied as well as practical sociology. The emphasis placed upon the applied aspects of the subject does not necessarily imply that the more general and theoretical aspects are not of importance.

There is an additional reason why a department of sociology in an urban university should give special attention to practical sociology. As we all know, much social work is now being done without any recognized scientific basis and methods of work are being followed that are far from scientific. Many social workers are themselves lamenting the lack of coordination and of a common understanding about fundamentals which prevails even in connection with some of the best and most efficient work. Under these conditions the sociologist, if he familiarizes himself with the applied aspects of his subject, ought to be able to contribute something that will be of value. His department ought to inculcate a wider knowledge,

at least among college students, of the need in every community for a constructive social policy and of what is involved in the formulation and administration of such a policy; his department ought to assume at least a measure of responsibility for promoting the growth and extension of social work in proper directions and by proper methods. The sociologist is overlooking a splendid opportunity if he does nothing that will tend directly to make practical social work more scientific, more systematic, more comprehensive in its scope, more efficient.